

Response

Claims 1 – 17, 19 – 25, and 45 -56 are pending in the subject application. Claims 18 and 26 – 44 were previously cancelled. Claims 51 – 56 have been rejected have and now have been cancelled with this Response. Claims 1 – 17, 19 – 25 and 45 – 50 have been allowed. Accordingly, all of the Claims now pending have been previously allowed.

The Examiner has objected to the Specification with respect to FIG. 16B as not properly described in the “Brief Description of the Figures.” The Examiner is directed to paragraph [0037] of the subject Specification in which FIG. 16 B has been described in the Brief Description of the Figures. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that FIG. 16B has been properly described in the Brief Description of the Figures and requests that Examiner’s objection should be withdrawn.

The Examiner has objected to the Specification in that Page 12, line 28, the use of element “block 46” with respect to FIG. 1, appears to be a typo, as FIG. 1 does not have any element with this label. The applicant submits that a review of FIG. 1 does disclose “block 46.” Accordingly, the Applicant requests that the Examiner’s objection be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 51 and 53 – 56 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement is respectfully traversed.

Claims 51 and 53 – 56 have been cancelled. Accordingly, the rejection of Claims 51 and 53 – 56 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, should be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claim 51, 53 and 55 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention is respectfully traversed.

Claims 51, 53 and 55 have been cancelled. Accordingly, Claims 51, 53 and 55 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, should be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claim 51 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Armato III et al. is respectfully traversed.

Claim 51 has been cancelled. Accordingly, the rejection of Claim 51 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Armato III et al. should be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claim 52 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tobin in view of Tannenbaum et al. in view of Bitter et al. is respectfully traversed.

Claim 52 has been cancelled. Accordingly, the rejection of Claim 52 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Tobin in view Tannenbaum et al. in view Bitter et al. should be withdrawn.

Conclusion:

Claims 51 – 56 have been rejected have and now have been cancelled with this Response. Claims 1 – 17, 19 – 25 and 45 – 50 have been allowed. Accordingly, all of the Claims now pending have been previously allowed. In view of the foregoing, the Subject Application is now in condition for allowance.

December 14, 2010

Respectfully submitted,



Mark F. Smith
Smith Brandenburg Ltd.
905 Ohio Pike
Cincinnati, Ohio 45245
(513) 379-5846 Phone
(513) 752-5350 Fax
marks@sbtechnologylaw.com